

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
FRIDAY, MAY 12, 2000
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

2nd Dist. Cedars-Sinai Imaging Medical Group, Petitioner
B140808 v.
Div. 1 Los Angeles County Superior Court, Respondent
S088151 Sheila G. Moore, Real Party in Interest
Application for stay and petition for review DENIED.

2nd Dist. People, Respondent
B129589 v.
Div. 7 Paul Patchen, Appellant
The time for granting or denying review on the court's own motion is hereby extended to and including June 23, 2000, or the date upon which review is either granted or denied. Rule 28(a)(1), California Rules of Court.

2nd Dist. People, Respondent
B130809 v.
Elen Rodriguez, Appellant
The time for granting or denying review on the court's own motion is hereby extended to and including June 12, 2000, or the date upon which review is either granted or denied. Rule 28(a)(1), California Rules of Court.

2nd Dist. People, Respondent
B133667 v.
Wilbert Matheney, Appellant
The time for granting or denying review on the court's own motion is hereby extended to and including June 9, 2000, or the date upon which review is either granted or denied. Rule 28(a)(1), California Rules of Court.

S012944 People, Respondent
v.
Richard Ramirez, Appellant
On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including July 14, 2000.

S086528 In re **James Edward Wilkoski** on Discipline

It is hereby ordered that **James Edward Wilkoski, State Bar No. 49860**, be disbarred from the practice of law and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys. Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

S086530 In re **Robert Neil Marcus** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Robert Neil Marcus, State Bar No. 158299**, be suspended from the practice of law for three years and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for three years subject to the conditions of probation, including one year actual suspension and until he makes restitution to Diane May (or the Client Security Fund, if appropriate) of \$26,493.00, plus 10% interest per annum from August 5, 1994, and provides the Probation Unit of the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel, Los Angeles, with satisfactory evidence thereof. If he is actually suspended for two years or more, he shall remain actually suspended until he provides proof to the satisfaction of the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. He is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its decision filed December 16, 1999, as modified by its order filed January 26, 2000. It is also ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination during the period of his actual suspension. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) It is further ordered that he comply with rule 955, California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Bus. & Prof. Code section 6140.7.

*See Business & Professions Code, § 6126, subdivision (c).

S086594 In re **Judith A. Finch** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Judith A. Finch, State Bar No. 114851**, be suspended from the practice of law for two years and until she has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of her rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct; and until she provides satisfactory proof to the State Bar Probation Unit that the judgment entered in *Wilson v. Finch*, Alameda County Superior Court case no. 776653-4, has been satisfied; that execution of suspension be stayed; and that she be placed on probation for two years on condition that she be actually suspended for 30 days and until she provides satisfactory proof to the Probation Unit of satisfaction of the judgment in *Wilson v. Finch* as described above. Respondent is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation executed January 26, 2000. If the period of actual suspension is two years or greater, she shall remain suspended until she has complied with standard 1.4(c)(ii) as set forth above. It is further ordered that respondent take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order or during the period of her actual suspension, whichever is longer. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) If the period of her actual suspension exceeds 90 days, it is also ordered that she comply with rule 955, California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 120 and 130 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.7.

*See Business & Professions Code, § 6126, subdivision (c).

S086595 In re **David C. Anton** on Discipline

It is ordered that **David C. Anton, State Bar No. 94852**, be suspended from the practice of law for one year; that execution of suspension be stayed; and that he be placed on probation for two years on condition that he be actually suspended for 45 days. Respondent is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation executed January 12, 2000. It is further ordered that respondent take and pass the Multistate

Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order, unless he provides proof of prior passage to the State Bar Probation Unit with his first quarterly report. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.7.

*See Business & Professions Code, § 6126, subdivision (c).

S086596

In re **Steven Joseph Barth** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Steven Joseph Barth, State Bar No. 104204**, be suspended from the practice of law for two years, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years on condition that he be actually suspended for 45 days. Respondent is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed February 8, 2000. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.7.

